REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated April 12, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of objection and rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, Applicant adds new claims 9-10. Therefore, Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Preliminary Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for returning the initialed form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 12, 2005. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for indicating that the Formal Drawings submitted on December 12, 2005 have been accepted.

II. Summary of the Office Action

8.

The Examiner objected to the specification for minor informalities and rejected claims 1-

III. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification due to various informalities.

Applicant has amended the specification to improve readability. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita *et al*. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0043886, hereinafter "Fujita") in view of Umeda *et al*. (U.S. Patent

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q91286

Application No.: 10/560,244

No. 5,936,326, hereinafter "Umeda"). Applicant traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

With regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner correctly concedes that Fujita does not specifically mention the size of the two portions of the conductor. However, the Examiner relies upon paragraphs [0143] and [0144] of Fujita, which disclose that a varnish 26 is applied to the coil-end groups and thereby improving the insulating characteristics, and contends that with an extra coat of resin or varnish, the conductor thickness of the crossover portion must be greater than that of the conductor of the slot-in portion. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

By contending that with an extra coat of resin or varnish, the conductor thickness of the crossover portion must be greater than that of the conductor of the slot-in portion, the Examiner seems to suggest that the insulating coating under the extra coat of resin or varnish on the crossover portion and the insulating coating on the slot-in portion must have uniform thickness. However, Fujita does not disclose that the insulating coating under the extra coat of resin or varnish on the crossover portion and the insulating coating on the slot-in portion have uniform thickness. Furthermore, Fujita discloses that the cross-sectional areas of the crossover portion and the slot-in portion are different. See Fig. 6. Accordingly, one may conclude that the insulating coating under the extra coat of resin or varnish on the crossover portion and the insulating coating on the slot-in portion have different thickness because of the different characteristics of the surface areas of the crossover portion and the slot-in portion. In short, in Fujita, there is no disclosure or suggestion that at least a longer side portion of the conductor of the slot-in portion located in the slots has an insulation coating of which thickness is smaller than that of insulation coating in the cross-over portion.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q91286

Application No.: 10/560,244

In view of the foregoing reasons, claim 1 should be patentable. Clams 3, 4, 7, and 8

should be patentable at least because of their dependency from claim 1. Claims 2, 5 and 6 should

be patentable at least because of their dependency from claim 1 and because Umeda fails to cure

the deficiencies of Fujita.

V. New Claims

Claims 9 and 10 are added to further describe the invention and are patentable at least by

virtue of their dependency.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue, the

Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number

listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/ Nataliya Dvorson

Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 12, 2007

11